OE FORM 6000, 2/69

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC REPORT RESUME

ERIC ACC. NO.	P.A.	PUBL. DATE	ISSUE
ED 033 263			
CH ACC. NO.			
AA 000 433		Dec 69	RIE MAR 70

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☒
ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☐ NO ☒
LEVEL OF AVAILABILITY I ☒ II ☐ III ☐

AUTHOR
Cohen, David K.

TITLE
Immigrants and the Schools: A Review of Research. ERIC-IRCD Urban Disadvantaged Series, Number 8.

SOURCE CODE	INSTITUTION (SOURCE)
BBB00899	Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y., ERIC Clearinghouse on the Urban Disadvantaged
SP. AG. CODE	SPONSORING AGENCY
RMQ66000	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

EDRS PRICE	CONTRACT NO.	GRANT NO.
0.25;1.15	OEC-0-9-420088-2327(010)	
REPORT NO.		BUREAU NO.

AVAILABILITY

JOURNAL CITATION

DESCRIPTIVE NOTE
21p.

DESCRIPTORS
*Immigrants; *Educational Research; *Literature Reviews; *Educational Retardation; *Social Mobility; Performance Tests; Caucasian Students; Non English Speaking; Disadvantaged Schools; Intelligence Quotient; Ethnic Origins; Academic Achievement; Data; Test Results; Jews; Italian Americans

IDENTIFIERS
Polish Children; Russian Jews; German Children; Scandinavian Children

ABSTRACT
This study compares various measures of school performance for immigrant and native white children, in approaching the question of schooling and social mobility. Research on the following is evaluated: (1) surveys of school retardation carried out at the turn of the century, (2) differences in retardation rates between children from English and non-English-speaking countries, (3) rank order of nationalities for high school and elementary school completion, (4) rank order of nationalities in IQ tests among elementary and high school children, (5) relation between ethnicity and high school selection, and (6) importance of ethnicity and class to educational achievement among immigrants. The evidence presented suggests that pupils from many immigrant groups were much more likely to be retarded than their native white schoolmates, more likely to make low scores on IQ tests, and a good deal less likely to remain in high school. There was, however, a good deal of variability in immigrant children's educational attainment: some groups (Jewish) did as well or better than the average for native whites, and others (central and southern European non-Jewish, and to a lesser extent, Irish) much worse. (RJ)

GPO 870-390

ED033263

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ERIC-IRCD URBAN DISADVANTAGED SERIES

Number 8, December 1969

IMMIGRANTS AND THE SCHOOLS

A REVIEW OF RESEARCH

AA000433

David K. Cohen, Ph.D.

Executive Director
Center for Educational Policy Research
Graduate School of Education
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

ERIC INFORMATION RETRIEVAL CENTER ON THE DISADVANTAGED

Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute · Teachers College · Columbia University · New York, N.Y. 10027

This paper was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

This paper is one of a series of bibliographies and review papers produced by the ERIC Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged under Contract OEC-0-9-420088-2327 (010) between the U. S. Office of Education and Teachers College, Columbia University. It was originally commissioned by ERIC-IRCD under Contract OE-6-10-240 between the U. S. Office of Education and Yeshiva University. The paper has been assigned the ERIC-IRCD accession number UD 09504. After it is announced in Research in Education (RIE), the monthly index to ERIC acquisitions, additional copies may be obtained through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, National Cash Register Company, 4936 Fairmont Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland 20014. Order this document by ED number listed in RIE.

December 1969

It is hard to imagine anything more characteristically American than our faith in the efficacy of schooling. Particularly since the late nineteenth century, public education has been viewed as an antidote for the diminishing equality of opportunity generally thought to be associated with cities, industry, immigration, and hardening class structure.

This view of schooling is based on the idea that in advanced industrial societies occupational success depends heavily upon knowledge and intellectual competence. Although we are accustomed to the way that notion was expressed in Brown v. Board of Education and the Sputnik debates, Ellwood Cubberley put it just as aptly in 1909, when he wrote of industrialism:

> Along with these changes there has come not only a tremendous increase in the quantity of our knowledge, but also a demand for a large increase in the amount of knowledge necessary to enable one to meet the changed conditions of our modern life. The kind of knowledge needed, too, has fundamentally changed. The ability to read and write and cipher no longer distinguishes the educated from the uneducated man. A man must have better, broader, and a different kind of knowledge than did his parents if he is to succeed under modern conditions.[1]

The Baconian notion that knowledge is power is extended here to the idea that it is the key to individual social and economic status. It is hardly a step from this to the view that schooling is worth money; although the identification of knowledge with progress was at least as old as Condorcet, only at the turn of the century was this given a peculiarly American turn in studies of income returns to schooling.[2]

The other side of this is the argument that schooling can prevent social problems. It was put succinctly in 1917, by P. P. Claxton, then U. S. Commissioner of Education:

This paper is part of a larger study of ethnicity and education now in progress; the essay will be published in the Review of Educational Research, February 1970.

> Comparatively few are aware of the close relationship between education and the production of wealth, and probably fewer still understand fully the extent to which the wealth and the wealth-producing power of any people depend on the quality and quantity of education...Poverty is not to be pleaded as a reason for withholding the means of education, but rather as a reason for supplying it in larger proportion. (emphasis added)[3]

The thinking behind this involved a few key notions. For one thing, cities typically attract domestic or foreign peasant immigrants; education could prevent their being constrained, lumpen, at the bottom of the heap, by offering paths to occupational attainment based on merit. Allowing the able to work their way up might reduce social tension and avoid class warfare. In addition, by offering certain minimal training to all, the schools would encourage punctuality, cleanliness, and respect and would therefore reduce crime and disorder. This would improve the quality of life for the laboring class and the quality of labor for the owning class.

The argument that the public school system should (or did) work on the basis of merit to promote occupational mobility can be found in widely disparate places. It is no surprise to find a liberal school reformer making the argument, but E. L. Thorndike, who thought environment had a trivial impact on intelligence, also argued that schools should select from all classes on the basis of measured intelligence.[4]

The liberal argument is nicely illustrated by the following excerpt from one of Frank Carlton's essays:

> The rapid growth of our cities has been a marked feature of our growth and development. The race must adapt itself to urban conditions. If the United States is to continue on its present course of advancement and progress the city must be made clean, healthy, moral, and it must be well governed.
>
> The great problems connected with the city...are at the root questions of education. The school must broaden the civic and social life of the entire community. It must supply, or attempt to supply, those elements which have been lost owing to recent changes, and it must also develop the new elements which our present civic, social, and industrial conditions necessitate....
>
> If children are found in our crowded schoolrooms who are not readily amenable to the discipline there in force, it should be clear that the correct kind of training is not given them. Children from all kinds of homes and home environments should not be treated exactly

> alike, if good results are to follow our efforts. Financially--let the taxpayer take notice--it is more desirable to treat the case now than later.... These are not bad children; they are rather "morally sick." Improper training and environment have made them what they are today.[4a]

Peasant immigrants typically stand outside the mainstream of the national political culture; if the schools could teach them the language and the main features of the political system, the newcomers might then be expected to assume the responsibilities of citizenship.

These ideas form a rough general system, which has more and more dominated educational thought and practice since the turn of the century. It is not the property of any particular sect or party, but amounts to a popular ideology of social reform. Since it holds that schooling is the best remedy for inequalities of opportunity, the ideology assumes that adult social and economic status is determined on the basis of standards similar to those used to evaluate school performance: chiefly intelligence, but also order, discipline, and a respect for authority. It also implies the usually unnoticed idea that the desideratum of social reform is not the aggregate redistribution of social and economic status, but the maintenance of merit standards on the basis of which qualified individuals can effect a personal redistribution.

Finally, a view of history is involved. Schooling, it is argued, "worked" for immigrants who arrived from Europe around the turn of the century, but does not seem to have had the same effect for Negroes.[5] The reasons advanced to support this account of events vary considerably: some suggest that it was due to the fact that individual city schools were then politically and culturally more identified with (controlled by?) the immigrant groups they served; others maintain that the quality of teachers' commitment in the cities then was greater;[6] still others argue that immigrants did not meet the racial bigotry which Negro children face in city schools today.[7] But whatever the reasons, it is widely believed that while public education provided the means by which southern and eastern Europeans moved up the social and economic ladder and into the cultural and political mainstream, it is not currently performing the same service for Negroes.

Although there is good reason to believe that this conclusion holds for Negroes, there is not exactly an abundance of evidence that it ever held for anyone else. What does the historical record suggest?

II

Were the idea that education caused mobility to be directly tested, data which linked family background, school experience and performance, and adult social and economic status would be required. This evidence would have to have been collected from a series of adult populations, each representative of a ten or twenty year period, going back to the last decade or two of the nineteenth century. This would permit comparisons of the effects of family, school, ethnic group membership, and social class upon adult status, and it would allow estimation of change in the relationships over time. Unfortunately, however, such stuff is found only in the dreams of sociologists and social historians--the real world contains little cumulative evidence of this sort.

One possible approach to these questions, however, is to compare various measures of school performance for immigrant and native white children. The earliest direct evidence on this point arises from surveys of school retardation carried out at the turn of the century. The appearance of these studies coincides with the entrance of large numbers of immigrant children into city schools. Quite a few efforts were made in the first decade on the century, but the first large-scale survey involving immigrants was published in 1909, by Leonard Ayres.[8] It covered more than fifty city school systems throughout the country, in an effort to determine the extent of retardation.

Ayres found enormous variation among city school systems. Only eighteen per cent of all the students in Boston's public schools, but nearly sixty per cent of those in Cincinnati's were retarded; the average seems to have been around thirty per cent.[9] But such comparisons are only valid if the underlying phenomenon is the same in all cases. If cities followed dissimilar practices with respect to promotion, the variation among retardation rates would reflect these disparate practices and the results would be non-comparable.

This problem seems to have escaped Ayres, for he presented no evidence on it; he did, however, conduct a depth study in New York City, and it seems reasonable to presume more uniform promotion policies in one city. He collected the records of 20,000 children from fifteen public elementary schools. The analysis revealed that slightly more than twenty-three per cent of all students were at least a year behind the expected grade for their age.[10] This suggests that the average among the entire group of cities (about thirty per cent) may not have been far from the mark; at least the order of magnitude of the two estimates is not greatly different.

Ayres also pursued the relationship between nationality and retardation in this depth study. The results of computing retardation rates by national origin are displayed in Table I. It reveals that retardation was twice as great for Irish and Italian children as for students of native or mixed parentage, but it shows even greater variation among immigrant groups themselves.

Table I: Grade Retardation in Fifteen New York City Elementary Schools, by Nationality, 1908.*

Nationality	Per cent of students retarded at least one grade
German	16
American	19
Russian	23
English	24
Irish	29
Italian	36

*Ayres, op. cit., Table 57, p. 107. Ayres reports that he also tabulated the results separately for each school, in order to determine whether local school conditions (such as type of neighborhood, school policies, or predominant nationality, for example), produced variations in the distribution of retardation rates. He reports that they did not, but he did not report the results.

Children of German parents were less often retarded than any other group, including native white Americans. Although it is easy to imagine reasons for such variations--ethnic differences in duration of stay and language acquisition or social class, or both--Ayres' data were not amenable to exploring these questions. They tell us only that retardation was severe for some immigrant groups, mild for others, and on the whole somewhat higher for immigrants than native Americans.

Another study of retardation in New York City secondary schools was carried out at about the same time, by J. K. Van Denburgh, a member of the Teachers College faculty.[11] Although the extremely selective character of secondary education at the turn of the century means that the results must be approached with caution, the rank order of nationalities for high school completion is roughly the same as that for elementary school children. Van Denburgh's data permit computation of retention rates (per cent of those entering high school who graduated) for several nationality groups. The retention rates were .1% and 0% for Irish and Italian children, respectively, 10% for native whites, 10.8% for those

from Britain, 15% for those from Germany, and 16% for Russian children.*

These issues were explored in a much larger and more precise study of schools and nationality carried out in 1908-09, and published in 1911 by the U.S. Immigration Commission.[12] The survey covered all schools, students, and teachers in thirty cities (twenty of which were the country's largest in point of population), producing information on 2,036,376 pupils. Its estimate of retardation was based on a less liberal definition of age-grade norms than Ayres', and thus the results suggested a greater average retardation rate--thirty-six percent--than given in the New York depth study.[13] Retardation for native American white children was twenty-eight per cent, as against forty per cent for children of foreign-born parents.[14] This considerable difference was accentuated when language variations were taken into account; children of immigrant parents from English-speaking countries were no more often retarded (twenty-seven per cent) than children of native white parents, but more than forty-three per cent of immigrant children from non-English-speaking countries were retarded.[15]

Since the Immigration Commission used a uniform measure of retardation in all the cities it studied, these results seem reasonably solid. Retardation in city schools was nearly twice as severe for those immigrant children whose parents arrived from non-English-speaking countries as it was for native urban whites. The evidence for immigrant children of the first generation, at least, is that they had no easy time of it in city schools.

But the difference in retardation rates between children from English and non-English-speaking countries suggests that variations in exposure to the language and culture may have affected retardation. This idea did not escape the Immigration Commission's research workers; although they did not carry out a longitudinal study of children, they did tabulate retardation by several variables which measured exposure. Father's citizenship status, child's place of birth, child's age upon arrival in the U. S., language spoken in the home, all revealed an inverse relationship between retardation and exposure.[16] The most dramatic comparisons arose from a variable which seems to have measured the length of time which the child had been exposed to the American language and culture; the results are displayed in Table II, for a few nationality groups.

---

* Both Van Denburgh and Ayres thought these were exclusively Jewish.

Table II: Retardation in School and Birthplace of Student.*

Nationality	Per cent Retarded: Born in city surveyed	Per cent Retarded: Born abroad
Native White	26.7	--
English	24.3	29.9
German	31.3	51.0
Russian Jews	29.6	59.9
Italian	57.0	76.7
Irish	27.6	54.8

*The Children of Immigrants, op. cit., vol. 1, Table 16, p.32.

In a sense, the most interesting aspect of the table is not that exposure affected retardation, but that it seemed to have had differential effects among the ethnic groups. The rate for Russian Jews and the Irish was cut almost precisely in half (down to the average for native urban whites) by controlling exposure , while for Italians it fell by slightly less than one-third. It also appears that the exposure variables measured more than linguistic skills: Irish children born abroad (but in an English-speaking country), were twice as likely to be retarded as Irish children born in the United States. It is easy to imagine that this could result from cultural variations, or differences in acculturation, but the Immigration Commission--as well as other observers--pointed to social and economic class differences between earlier and later immigrants. Those who arrived around the turn of the century (whose children, therefore, would have been less likely to have been born in the United States), were generally believed to have been poorer and less well educated.[17]

Did rates of retardation for immigrant children decline as the century wore on? There is some evidence on this point from several smaller studies. One was undertaken in New York City in the early 1930's by J. B. Maller, a member of the Teachers College faculty. He surveyed all the city's elementary schools in 1931, and computed school progress rates for several nationality groups.[18] Although his ethnic groups do not always correspond to those in the Ayres study, the available comparisons are worth considering. Where Ayres found an overall retardation rate of about twenty-three per cent, Maller found one of twenty-nine; where Ayres found a retardation rate of about thirty-five percent for Italians, Maller found thirty-five per cent; where Ayres found a retardation rate of about twenty-three per cent for Russians (Russian Jews, apparently), Maller reported a retardation rate for Jews of twenty-five.[19] Although it would be unwise to attach much importance to any one of these numbers, the overall similarity in their order of magnitude is striking. In New York City, at least, there seems to have been little change in retardation rates for foreign-born children between 1900 and 1930.

Another effort was carried out in the public elementary schools in Minneapolis and St. Paul in 1919.[20] Some of the results are presented in Table III.

Table III: Retardation Rates for Elementary School Pupils, Minneapolis and St. Paul, 1919.

Nationality	Per cent Retarded		
	"Pure" Nationality (I)*	Immigration Commission (II)	"Impure" Nationality (III)
Native White	32.0	(37.2)	--
German	42.9	(46.2)	31.2
Swedish	41.2	(41.4)	28.0
Russian Jews	45.5	(39.4)	18.7
Polish	55.2	(--)	--
Italian	61.1	(--)	--

*The "Pure" nationality designations refer to children whose parents and grandparents were from that nationality group, and the "Impure" designation to children whose parents and grandparents had intermarried with Americans, or members of other ethnic groups.

The first column contains results only for children of unmixed parentage; it reveals substantially greater retardation for immigrants than native whites. The Immigration Commission's results for Minneapolis--dating from 1908--are displayed in parentheses in the second column.[21] They are little different from the rates for the same ethnic groups eleven years later.

The third column of the table is interesting for other reasons. It displays the rates of retardation for children of "mixed" parentage; such children, of course, were less likely to be insulated in ethnic subcultures. The percentages reflect this, for the retardation rates for "impure" ethnics were lower than those for "pure ethnics." This suggests--as did the Commission's comparisons of children born here and abroad--that assimilation had something to do with school progress. The continued severity of retardation for Italians and Poles is a case in point; it may in part be explained by the fact that they were less likely to assimilate than other ethnic groups. The table indicates, for example, that there were insufficient cases of mixed marriages in these two groups to compute retardation rates in column III.

Research on the intelligence of immigrant children--most of which was undertaken in the decade following World War I--provides indirect evidence on school retardation among immigrants. The studies involved a wide variety of tests, and elementary school children of several ages and places; yet, the rank order of nationalities varied only a little. One study of New York City school children, for example, yielded the median I.Q. scores displayed in Table IV.[22]

Table IV: Median I.Q. Scores for New York City Ten-Year-Olds, 1919.

Nationality	Median I.Q.	N
Native White	108.5	48
Italian	84.3	28

Another study of California fifth graders about the same age showed that the Median I.Q. for Native Whites was around 110, and around 85 for children of Italian-born parents.[23] Other studies report roughly similar findings in comparisons of these groups during the 1920's.[24] Although I.Q. is not the same thing as retardation, the two were not unrelated: research on New York City's elementary schools in 1930 found that the correlation between school average retardation and school average I.Q. was .698.[25]

Although much less research seems to have been carried out in secondary schools, the I.Q. differences persisted at the high school level. One study of the Hartford, Conn., high school in the early 1920's revealed the I.Q. differences displayed in Table V.[26]

Table V: Ethnicity and I.Q., Hartford High School Freshmen

Nationality	I.Q.	Nationality	I.Q.
Scotch & English	105	French	98
Native White	103	Irish	98
Jewish	103	Polish	97
German	103	Italian	97
Scandinavian	102		

Although the differences are not as great as those for elementary school children, this was probably due to the greater selectivity of secondary schools.

The Hartford research also illuminated the relation between ethnicity and high school selection. There appear to have been only small differences among ethnic groups in the likelihood of entering high school: the ethnic proportions within the freshman class correspond quite closely to the ethnic proportions in the entire city's population. Jews were slightly over-represented in the freshman classes, and native whites slightly under-represented, but these differences were small. Staying power, however, was rather a different question. Table VI presents the ratio between high school freshmen and juniors, for each ethnic group.[27] Thus, the numbers in column C can be read as probabilities--that is, as the number of chances in one hundred a freshman from each of the groups had of reaching the junior year.

Table VI: Ethnicity and High School Retention, Hartford, Conn.

Nationality	(A) Number in Freshman class	(B) Number in Junior class	Percent B of A
Native White	892	572	64
Jewish	518	416	80
Irish	278	88	34
Italian	206	58	28
Scandinavian	114	56	48
Polish	90	22	24
German	86	40	44
English & Scotch	76	34	44
Total	2,260	886	38

Overall, the chances of lasting until the junior year were slightly less than four in ten, but there was enormous variation by nationality. Polish and Italian students had about 2.5 chances in ten of staying on until the junior year, whereas native whites had over six chances in ten. The Irish were a bit below the average, and the Germans were slightly above it. Jews who entered the freshman class stood eight chances in ten of staying till their junior year, better than twice the city average.

It would be nice to know how much these differences owed to variation among ethnic groups in intelligence, or in inherited social and economic status, but there are no data on the students' social and economic status. It is possible in some cases to get a rough idea, however, of the differences that could not have been due to I. Q. Table V shows that the mean I. Q. for English and Scots children was 105,

and 103 for native whites, Jews, and Germans. Yet Jews were twice as likely as Germans, Scots, and English pupils to wind up in the Junior class three years later, and half again as likely as native whites. Thus, group-to-group variation in I. Q. seems unrelated to group-to-group variation in school retention. Although one might argue that these first-generation Jewish families had a social and economic edge on the Germans, it seems a doubtful idea; what is more, it would be fantastic to assume that they had such an advantage over native whites. The differences in staying power in this case seem much more likely to result from variations in culture and motivation than from intellectual or social and economic differences.

But this goes only a small part of the way toward assessing the relative importance of ethnicity and class to educational attainment among immigrants. Unhappily, at the moment there is no really satisfactory direct way of exploring this. My search of the literature reveals only three studies which considered both factors at once. The results of one of these lonely and limited efforts (concerning Italians and native whites), are displayed in Table VII.[28]

Table VII: Nationality, Social Class, and Intelligence, California Twelve-Year-Olds (Alpha Scores by Taussig Occupation Scale).

Father's Occupation	Native white	N	Italian	N
Professional	83.35	(27)	--	--
Semi-prof. & business	67.30	(100)	40.70	(25)
Skilled workers	54.75	(120)	36.06	(32)
Semi-skilled	41.60	(51)	35.92	(37)
Common labor	48.60	(18)	19.57	(102)
Mean	60.40	(316)	28.20	(196)

Although the mean ethnic differences are in some cases narrowed by taking father's occupation into account, they are by no means eliminated. The results--which are roughly paralleled by the other two studies--suggest that ethnic differences in the distribution of occupational status accounted for some, but by no means all of the variation among ethnic groups in educational attainment. A study on the class-ethnicity issue by Arlitt involved 343 primary grade children from a single unidentified school district. The comparisons were between native white and Italian children; the Taussig scale of occupations was employed, and the I. Q.'s were on the Binet Scale. The results are displayed below:

	Median I. Q. for Entire Ethnic Group	Median I. Q. for Lowest Two SES Groups
Native White	106.5	92.0
Italian	85.0	85.0

The first column gives the simple comparison between the two groups; the second column takes father's occupation differences into account to some extent. It displays the median I.Q.'s for those children whose fathers were semi-skilled and unskilled laborers; the comparisons could only be carried out for this group, since no Italian children had fathers with other occupations.[29] The results of another ethnicity-class study by Bere pretty well parallel those of Arlitt and Young.[29a]

Although this reveals that simple ethnic comparisons were quite misleading, it does not resolve the issue. It is as easy to believe that further controls for class and urbanism would have eliminated the ethnic differences as to believe that much of the variation was due to culture, not class.

In summary, then, although the evidence I have presented is fragmentary and often non-comparable, it suggests that in the first generation, at least, children from many immigrant groups did not have an easy time in school. Pupils from these groups were much more likely to be retarded than their native white schoolmates, more likely to make low scores on I. Q. tests, and they seem to have been a good deal less likely to remain in high school. What is more, it appears that children of first-generation immigrants from these groups had as difficult a time in the 1920's or 1930's as their predecessors experienced during the first decade of the century.

It must be equally clear, however, that being the son or daughter of an immigrant did not in itself result in below-average educational attainment. Children whose parents emigrated from England, Scotland, Wales, Germany, and Scandinavia seem to have generally done about as well in school as native whites; certainly their average performance never dropped much below that level. And the children of Jewish immigrants typically achieved at or above the average for native whites. It was central and southern European non-Jewish immigrants--and, to a lesser extent, the Irish--who experienced really serious difficulty in school. On any index of educational attainment, whether it was retardation, achievement scores, I. Q., or retention, children from these nationalities were a good deal worse off than native urban whites.

Perhaps the most interesting question this raises involves the origin of these ethnic differences: did they arise primarily from group differences in inherited social and economic attributes, or were they chiefly the consequence of differences in culture and motivation? At first glance, the second seems a likely alternative; after all, the main over-achievers--the Jews--typically placed a great value on education. But there is more to it than that, for there is evidence which suggests

that the rank order of intelligence among immigrant groups would correspond roughly to their rank order on an index of urbanization. This is clearest if we compare the Italians (most of whom emigrated from southern Italy) and the Poles, with immigrants from Germany, or with the Jews. It is interesting to note, in this connection, that there were very great differences among the Jews, according to nation of origin. The U.S. Immigration Commission found that thirty-seven per cent of German Jewish children experienced school retardation, as against forty-one per cent for the Russian Jews, fifty-two per cent of the Rumanian Jews, and sixty-seven per cent of the Polish Jews. These proportions closely resemble those for non-Jews of those nationalities.[30]

In addition, there is some evidence that among the immigrant groups, those whose children achieved well stood somewhat higher on the occupational scale. Bere, for example, presents the following distribution of occupational classes on the Taussig scale, for Italian and Jewish fathers in her New York City study.[31]

Occupational Class	Per cent in each class	
	Italian	Jewish
Professional	--	--
Semi-Professional	6.75	13.04
Skilled	36.48	34.78
Semi-Skilled	17.56	45.65
Unskilled	39.19	6.52

Another important issue has to do with the schools' response to the immigrants. The arrival of large numbers of immigrant pupils coincided with the emergence of I. Q. and achievement testing, vocational guidance, and the movement to diversify instruction and curriculum in city schools. There is more than a little evidence that these practices were employed--if not conceived--as a way of providing the limited education schoolmen often thought suitable for children from the lower reaches of the social order. The tension this suggests also extended to the schools' culture: there is no evidence of any effort to employ the immigrants' language and culture as educational vehicles. I have been unable to find any hint that cultural diversity was entertained as a serious possibility; it appears that the WASP culture reigned supreme in urban public schools. In this connection, it is important to note that there appears to have been a substantial movement to create educational alternatives among some immigrant groups. For the Irish and Italians, of course, the Catholic parochial schools served this function, as did part-time religious schools for the Jews. There also were efforts--among the Bohemians, for example--to establish part-time "language schools" as a way of maintaining and transmitting the culture.

Finally, there is the question of schooling and social mobility. I have shown that there was a good deal of variability in immigrant children's educational attainment: some groups did as well or better than the average for native urban whites, and others much worse. But to show that the children of many immigrant groups had difficulty in school is not to show that education turned out to be a less effective way for them to climb the social and economic ladder. Almost all the results I have presented are based on evidence about the children of first generation immigrants, and it centers in the first two or three decades of the century. What data I have found on exposure to the urban American culture and society suggests that it coincided with drastically reduced educational differences between immigrants and native whites. Furthermore, the Duncans have presented evidence that education may have been no less important for the children of immigrants than for native whites, in accounting for differences in occupational attainment. [32]

This, however, is another part of the story, and like the other questions I have raised, it requires more attention than is possible here.

Availability Statement

This list of references contains documents available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), National Cash Register Company, 4936 Fairmont Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland 20014. Cost is indicated for microfiche (MF) and hardcopy (HC). Please include sales tax where applicable and $0.50 handling charge. Order by ED number only.

FOOTNOTES

1. Cubberley, E. Changing Conceptions of Education. Boston: Houghton, 1909, pp. 18-19.

2. There is no secondary work on these studies, nor even a bibliography. The best bibliography available for the outpouring of work around the turn of the century can be found in Ellis, A. C. The Money Value of Education. U. S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin #22, Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1917. Ellis' collection of materials seem pretty exhaustive, and it contains few studies that predate 1890.

3. These remarks were made in a Letter of Transmittal for the Ellis (op. cit., p. 3) volume.

4. Thorndike, Edward L. Educational Psychology. New York: The Science Press, 1908, pp. 44-46.

4a. Carlton, Frank T. "School as a Factor in Industrial and Social Problems," Education, 24:74-80; October, 1903.

5. See, for example, Weinberg, M. "A Yearning for Learning: Blacks and Jews Through History," Integrated Education, 7, no.3:28; May-June, 1969. Also, U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. Racial Isolation in the Public Schools. 2 vols. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967, vol. 1, p. 1. (Vol.I: ED012740 MF-$1.25 HC-$14.30; Vol.II: ED015959 MF-$1.25 HC-$14.65)

6. Kottmeyer, W. (Superintendent of Schools, St. Louis, Mo.), quoted in Calhoun, Lilian. "The AASA's Missing Minorities," Integrated Education, op. cit., p. 73.

7. Weinberg, op. cit.

8. Ayres, Leonard Porter. Laggards in Our Schools. New York: Charities Publication Committee, 1909. Among the other studies were: Corman, Oliver P. "The Retardation of the Pupils of Five City School Systems," Psychological Clinic, 1:245-257; Feb. 15, 1908. Faulkner, Roland P. "Some Further Considerations Upon the Retardation of the Pupils of Five City School Systems," Psychological Clinic, 2:57-74; May 15, 1908. Greenwood, James M. "Miring in the Grades and the Promotion of Pupils," Educational Review, 36:139-161; September, 1908.

9. Ayres, op. cit., p. 45, Table 22.

10. Op. cit., p. 107.

11. Van Denburgh, J. K. Elimination of Students in Public Schools in New York. New York: Teachers College, 1911. The percentages cited were computed from the table on p. 96.

12. U. S. Immigration Commission The Children of Immigrants in Schools 5 vols. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1911.

13. Op. cit., vol. 1, p. 31, Table 15. Ayres' definition of retardation was as follows: "All children up to the age of nine years were considered as of normal age for the first grade. Ten was the limit in the second grade, eleven in the third, and so on." Op. cit., p. 107. The Immigration Commission, on the other hand, defined a retarded pupil as one "...who is two or more years older than the normal age for his grade. Thus, a pupil is retarded if eight years or over in the first grade; nine years or over in the second grade..." Op. cit., vol. 1, p. 31. Thus, by Immigration Commission standards, Ayres' results substantially understated retardation rates. No doubt this accounts for most of the discrepancy between the two studies.

14. Ibid. All of the following data from the Commission's report were based on an intensive sub-study of 62,321 pupils in twelve cities, for whom more detailed information was gathered. For a description of the cities, op. cit., p. 27; for a description of the data forms, pp. 172-177.

15. Op. cit., p. 31, Table 15.

16. The relevant tables appear on pp. 33-37, op. cit. It is curious that while these tables provide one of the most persuasive early bits of evidence for the influence of environment on school progress, no one ever seems to have used them in the nature-nurture debates.

17. Hutchinson, E. P. Immigrants and Their Children. New York: John Wiley, 1956, pp. 64-66.

18. Maller, J. B. "Economic and Social Correlatives of School Progress in New York City," Teachers College Record, May, 1933, pp. 655-670.

19. Maller, op. cit., p. 664. Maller did not specify the criterion of school progress, save that pupils making slow progress were those the New York schools classified as "retarded." This seems to include all those a grade or more behind expectation for their age.

20. Jordan, Riverda H. Nationality and School Progress. Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Publishing Co., 1921. Table III is adapted from Jordan's Tables X and XI, pp. 36-37.

21. Op. cit., 4, p. 105.

22. Murdoch, K. "A Study of Race Differences in New York City," School and Society, 11, no. 266, Jan. 31, 1920. The study covered children of various ages in several Manhattan public schools. I present the youngest group, to minimize selection effects.

23. Young, K., "Intelligence Tests of Certain Immigrant Groups," Scientific Monthly, 15, no. 27, Nov., 1922, p. 422. In this case, a study of first-graders in California was involved.

24. One of the better studies was undertaken by Kimball Young, and published in the University of Oregon Publications ("Mental Differences in Certain Immigrant Groups"), 1, no. 11, July, 1922. Young studied about 800 elementary school children in the San Francisco Bay Area (San Jose and Santa Clara chief among the communities involved), and focused his analysis on Mexicans, Italians, and native whites, all age twelve. The scores for the native whites was 60.4, and the Italians 28.2, on the Army Alpha; Table XXV, p. 31.

Other studies of nationality and intelligence from this period include: Brown, G. L. "Intelligence as Related to Nationality," Journal of Educational Research, vol. 5, no. 4:326; April, 1922. Pintner, Rudolph. "Comparison of American and Foreign Children on Intelligence Tests," Journal of Educational Psychology, vol. 14, no. 2:292-295; 1923. Mead, M. "Group Intelligence Tests and Linguistic Disability Among Italian Children," School and Society, vol. 25, no. 642; April 16, 1927; Seago, D., and Kolodin, T. "A Comparative Study of the Mental Capacity of Sixth Grade Jewish and Italian Children," School and Society, vol. 22, no. 556, Oct. 31, 1925; Colvin, S., and Allen, R. "Mental Tests and Linguistic Ability," Journal of Educational Psychology, vol. 14, no. 1, Jan., 1923; Pintner, Rudolph, and Keller, Ruth. "Intelligence Tests of Foreign Children," Journal of Educational Psychology, 13:214-222, April, 1922. Brigham, C. "Intelligence Tests of Immigrant Groups," Psychological Review, vol. 37, 1930.

Perusal of these studies reveals that the debate over immigrant intelligence parallels quite precisely the debate over Negro intelligence. One of the main issues was whether the differences were genetic or environmental; the other was whether the tests were culturally and

linguistically biased against the immigrants. Although the measurement of intelligence and environment has improved somewhat since the 1920's, the terms of this discussion have changed not a bit: all that happened was that immigration--and thus immigrant intelligence--ceased to be a relevant political concern.

25. Maller, op. cit., p. 659.

26. Feingold, G. "Intelligence of the First Generation of Immigrant Groups," Journal of Educational Psychology, vol. 15, no. 2; Feb., 1924.

27. In the table the N's for the freshman class are based on freshmen pooled from four entering groups: Jan., 1923, Sept., 1922, Jan., 1922, and Sept., 1921. The junior class N's are pooled from Jan., 1921, and Sept., 1920 groups. This technique had the result probably unintended of reducing year-to-year variations. Since only two junior but four freshman classes were pooled, the percentages in column C would have sharply overstated attrition rates if the original N's had been used. The best way to deal with this seemed to be to multiply the column B N's by two, to compensate for the differences in pooled N's.

28. Young, K. "Mental Differences..." op. cit., pp. 28-30.

29. Arlitt, A. H. "On the Need for Caution in Establishing Race Norms," Journal of Applied Psychology, 1921, pp. 179-183.

29a. Bere, M. A Comparative Study of the Mental Capacity of Children of Foreign Parentage. New York: Teachers College, 1924, pp.61-62, 87-88.

30. The U. S. Immigration Commission, op. cit., vol. I, Table 15, p. 31.

31. Bere, op. cit., p. 55.

32. Duncan, B., and O. D. Duncan. "Minorities and the Process of Stratification," American Sociological Review, vol. 33, no. 3, June, 1968.